



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/699,665	11/04/2003	Christophe Gustave	ALC 3096	6478
7590 KRAMER & AMADO, P.C. Suite 240 1725 Duke Street Alexandria, VA 22314			EXAMINER HERRING, VIRGIL A	
			ART UNIT 2132	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 07/10/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/699,665

Applicant(s)

GUSTAVE ET AL.

Examiner

VIRGIL HERRING

Art Unit

2132

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 March 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 4-7 and 9-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 4-7 and 9-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-8508)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

This action is responsive to the arguments filed 17 March 2008. Claims 2, 3, and 8 were previously cancelled. Claims 1, 4-7, and 9-12 are currently pending.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 17 March 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant first argued that, with respect to claim 1, Patrick does not disclose the limitation "...mapping said authentication modules...". Applicant further argued that Patrick "associates one or more principals with the subject upon successful authentication," which is "not analogous to the recited step of mapping authentication modules... because relevant principals are associated with a subject only if the required login modules succeed in authentication." The examiner respectfully disagrees, noting that column 3, lines 1-3 state that "LoginContext 102 can consult configuration 106 to determine which specific login modules 110-118 to invoke in performing authentication of a subject." This implies that the configuration 106 stores a previously determined mapping of subjects to required modules.

Applicant then argued, with respect to claim 7, that Ferchichi fails to disclose, teach, or suggest "means... for sending an authenticating domain identifier to an authentication server, wherein said authenticating domain identifier comprises an application service identifier." Applicant further argued that Ferchichi discloses a single sign-on module realized as a software module, but not a plurality of software modules, and thus cannot use an applications service identifier as claimed. The examiner

respectfully disagrees, noting that ¶¶56-84 specify a plurality of authentication mechanisms stored in the smart card depicted in figure 13. Because a smart card is essentially just a processor and memory device in a card form, these authentication mechanisms must be software modules (i.e. a plurality of software modules). Furthermore, as the applicant pointed out that a single software module cannot use an application service identifier, the opposite must also be true; a plurality of software modules, such as those taught by Ferchichi, can use application service identifiers.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claim 1 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Patrick, U.S. 7,017,051.

As per claim 1, Patrick discloses a method of authenticating end-user clients requiring access to services available in a computer-based communication system, comprising the steps of:

- a) at an authentication server connected in said communication system, defining a list of authentication modules available in said communication system, and mapping said authentication modules to authenticating domain identifiers associated to end-user clients of said authentication server wherein said authenticating domain identifiers each comprise an application service identifier (2:60-67, 3:1-3, 8:39-53);
- b) sending, by an end-user client, respective authentication domain identifier to said authentication server (3:5-7, 10:56-59);

c) creating, by the authentication server and depending on the authentication domain identifier, an authentication stack specific to said end-user client, said stack comprising one or more stack entries, each mapped to a respective authentication module (3:18-34);

d) rendering, for each stack entry and depending thereon, an authentication service provided at said respective authentication module to produce an authentication result for that entry (3:35-45); and

e) consolidating authentication results to obtain an authentication status for the end-user client (9:32-50).

Claims 7, 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) and 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ferchichi et al. U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0012382 A1, (hereinafter "Ferchichi").

Regarding claim 7: Ferchichi discloses a method (Title) and system ([0048] module can include hardware and software) respectively, of authenticating an end-user client in a computer-based communication system comprising the steps of:

a) sending, by the end-user client, an authenticating domain identifier to an authentication server, wherein the authenticating domain identifier comprises an application service identifier ([0012] – [0015] request);

b) creating, by the authentication server and depending on the authentication domain identifier, an authentication stack comprising one or more stack entries ([0012] – [0015] store request);

c) rendering, for each stack entry and depending thereon, an authentication service to produce an authentication result for that entry ([0012] – [0015] check authentication mode); and

d) consolidating authentication results to obtain an authentication status for the end-user client ([0221] synchronization status).

Regarding claims 4 and 10: Ferchichi discloses that the authentication service includes local and remote services ([0049] – [0050] local authentication via single sign on module required for authentication for remote access).

Regarding claims 5 and 11: Ferchichi discloses that the local and remote services include biometric schemes ([0048] – [0050]), cryptographic hardware services ([0048] and [0064] cryptographic hardware), smart cards ([0048] – [0050]), and USB tokens ([0061] token).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 4 and 5 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Patrick in view of Ferchichi.

Regarding claim 4: Patrick substantially teaches local authentication services, but fails to disclose remote services (3:35-45). However, Ferchichi discloses that the authentication service includes remote services ([0049] – [0050] local authentication via single sign on module required for authentication for remote access). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to substitute a remote authentication service for a local authentication service.

Regarding claim 5: Patrick fails to disclose local and remote authentication services including biometrics, cryptographic hardware, smart cards and USB tokens. Ferchichi discloses that the local and remote services include biometric schemes ([0048] – [0050]), cryptographic hardware services ([0048] and [0064] cryptographic hardware), smart cards ([0048] – [0050]), and USB tokens (0061] token). It would have been obvious to utilize biometric schemes, cryptographic hardware services, smart cards and USB tokens as authentication services since, used on their own, they would yield the same result. Therefore, the combination of Patrick and Ferchichi would yield predictable results.

Claim 6 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Patrick in view of Saigo et al. (Saigo), U.S. Patent No. 6,587,880.

Regarding claim 6: Patrick fails to teach a method comprising sending a unique session identifier to the end-user client responsive to an authentication status corresponding to a successful authentication. However, Saigo discloses transmitting a session identifier to the user upon successful authentication (8:52-67). It would have been obvious to combine the inventions of Patrick and Saigo since transmitting a session identifier to the user upon successful authentication yields the same result of an authenticated user obtaining a session identifier.

Claims 9, and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferchichi in view of Shimada et al., U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0154373 A1, (hereinafter "Shimada").

Regarding claim 9: Ferchichi does not disclose that the authentication server, dependent on the application ID, retrieves a configuration specifying authentication application, which configuration is used for creating the authentication stack.

Shimada discloses that the authentication server, dependent on the application ID, retrieves a configuration specifying authentication application, which configuration is used for creating the authentication stack ([0040] configuration depends on application and device).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to modify Ferchichi by application dependent parameters as taught by Shimada in order to enable services to operate on a variety of platforms, (see Shimada [0040]).

Regarding claim 12: Ferchichi does not disclose that, responsive to an authentication status corresponding to a successful authentication, a unique session ID is sent to the end-user client.

Shimada discloses that, responsive to an authentication status corresponding to a successful authentication, a unique session ID is sent to the end-user client ([0457] session ID associated with user).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to modify Ferchichi by application dependent parameters as taught by Shimada in order to enable services to operate on a variety of platforms, (see Shimada [0040]).

Art Unit: 2132

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to VIRGIL HERRING whose telephone number is (571)272-8189. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gilberto Barron can be reached on (571) 272-3799. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Virgil Herring
Examiner
Art Unit 2132

/V. H./
Examiner, Art Unit 2132

/Gilberto Barron Jr/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2132